United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/25/GRC/3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
22 February 2016

Original: English

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Twenty-fifth session
2-13 May 2016

Summary prepared by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights in accordance with paragraph 15 (c) of the annex to Human Rights Council resolution 5/1 and paragraph 5 of the annex to Council resolution 16/21

Greece*

The present report is a summary of 11 stakeholders' submissions[1] to the universal periodic review. It follows the general guidelines adopted by the Human Rights Council in its decision 17/119. It does not contain any opinions, views or suggestions on the part of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), nor any judgement or determination in relation to specific claims. The information included herein has been systematically referenced in endnotes and, to the extent possible, the original texts have not been altered. As provided for in Human Rights Council resolution 16/21, where appropriate, a separate section is provided for contributions by the national human rights institution of the State under review that is accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles. The full texts of all submissions received are available on the OHCHR website. The report has been prepared taking into consideration the periodicity of the review and developments during that period.

* The present document was not edited before being sent to United Nations translation services.

I. Information provided by the national human rights institution of the State under review accredited in full compliance with the Paris Principles

1. The Greek National Commission for Human Rights (GNCHR) recommended that Greece ratify the International Convention on the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families (ICRMW); the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (OP-ICESCR); and the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on a communications procedure (CRC-OP-IC).[2]

2. GNCHR also recommended that Greece ratify the International Labour Organization (ILO) conventions: 129 concerning Labour Inspection in Agriculture; 97 concerning Migration for Employment (Revised); 183 concerning Maternity Protection; 189 concerning Domestic Workers; 121 concerning Employment Injury Benefits; 118 concerning Equality of Treatment of Nationals and Non-Nationals in Social Security; 94 concerning Labour Clauses in Public Contracts; and the 2002 Protocol to the Occupational Safety and Health Convention.[3]

3. GNCHR further recommended that Greece ratify Protocol No. 12 to the Council of Europe (CoE) Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (ECHR); the European Social Charter (revised); the CoE Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence; the European Convention on Nationality and the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities.[4]

4. GNCHR welcomed the National Human Rights Action Plan, the National Action Plan for Children's Rights, the Integrated Action Plan for the Social Inclusion of the Greek Roma, as well as the Revised National Action Plan on the reform of the asylum system and migration management, but was concerned at the absence of a national action plan against racism. It stated that national action plans should include concrete objectives in order for their implementation to be effectively monitored.[5]

5. GNCHR commented on the disproportionate impact of the crisis and austerity measures on women and stated that no progress had been recorded on this issue. It noted findings of the European Committee of Social Rights (CoE-ECSR) that fiscal consolidation decisions and austerity measures were taken without any impact assessment.[6]

6. GNCHR was concerned about the marginalization of women in the labour market which was reflected, inter alia, in the high female unemployment rates. Pension cuts affecting widows and other categories of women has also had a negative impact. State interventions relating to collective agreements had resulted in the widening of the gender pay gap. The rapid growth of flexible forms of employment and the imposition of replacement of indefinite contracts with fixed term contracts had led to a significant reduction in wages. GNCHR was further concerned at the lack of adequate public day-care structures for children and dependent persons, which limited women's ability to take up employment or kept them in jobs with reduced rights.[7]

7. GNCHR highlighted the findings of international monitoring bodies regarding the disproportionate impact of the crisis and austerity measures on young people and the systematic discrimination against them in the area of employment.[8]

8. GNCHR noted that in the Greek legal order the concept of "gender identity" remained almost unknown.[9]

9. GNCHR stated that it had repeatedly stressed the need to combat racism and xenophobia and recalled that it had offered recommendations to the authorities on this. It welcomed a 2014 ministerial decision providing for the protection to victims of, and essential witnesses to, racist crimes.[10]

10. GNCHR was concerned about the frequency, volume and character of recorded cases of arbitrary conduct of police officers. While noting that Law 3938 of 2011 provided for the establishment of an independent and effective mechanism for the investigation of complaints of ill-treatment by police, it considered that the Office responsible for handling alleged instances of abuses in the Ministry of Citizen Protection was inactive and that its overall institutional structure did not fulfil its scope and purpose.[11] It stated that any effective response to this phenomenon must include comprehensive and periodic human rights training for the security forces.[12]

11. GNCHR welcomed the existing law and national action plan on combating domestic violence; however, it was concerned that the law failed to address the essence of the phenomenon of violence against women and its root causes and did not create legal certainty as most of its provisions had not been incorporated into the relevant Codes.[13] It considered that awareness raising efforts were still needed. It noted that there was also no statistical data on violence based on gender, age, minority/ethnic origin and the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim. It called for a targeted and effective strategy for women's rights protection and promotion to be integrated in a framework of steadily provided and state-funded public services.[14]

12. GNCHR appreciated the need to accelerate the conclusion of legal proceedings, as Greece had been found in breach of the relevant provisions of the ECHR in several cases, but expressed concern that such measures might create more problems than those they would solve.[15] It was particularly concerned that the rapid increase in court fees may have an adverse impact on access to courts and recommended that litigation costs be abolished, at least for employment and social security cases, and drastically reduced for other cases.[16]

13. GNCHR underlined the need to regulate the relations between the State and the Church with a view to establishing distinct roles on the basis of the freedom of religion and international human rights standards.[17] GNCHR reiterated the need for a non-religious oath to be introduced in courts.[18]

14. GNHCR noted the findings of CoE-ECSR that several austerity measures taken in Greece violated labour and pension rights under the European Social Convention, thus driving workers and pensioners below the poverty threshold, and that none of these measures had been modified or repealed.[19] It also noted that several bodies of the ILO had expressed serious concerns about the impact of austerity policies on the implementation by Greece of ILO conventions and standards.[20]

15. GNCHR was alarmed that the drastic reduction in public health expenditure in 2014 had led to longer waiting times, higher fees, and the closure of hospitals.[21] It was concerned at the state of child and adolescent mental health; the number of new cases was increasing. Psychiatric services were not provided in schools.[22]

16. GNCHR observed that little progress had been made in the general situation of Roma, and particularly on issues pertaining to housing, education, access to employment and public services as well as access to clean water. It considered the segregation of Roma children to be unacceptable, but found that their dispersion in schools located in neighbouring areas as a means to avoid it was controversial.[23] It stated that the Integrated Action Plan for the Social Inclusion of the Greek Roma was already defunct and lacked solid legal guarantees.[24]

17. GNCHR was concerned that Greek legislation was not compliant with the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and that the independent monitoring mechanisms required under article 33 of the Convention had not been established.[25]

18. GNCHR referred to the unprecedented refugee emergency.[26] Prior to the summer 2015 influx, the GNCHR had welcomed the establishment of the new autonomous Asylum Service and the Appeals Authority, but stated that the new Asylum System remained understaffed and not all its regional offices had been established. GNCHR called on the Greek Authorities to investigate claims included in reports by international and European bodies, according to which operations of repulsion and *refoulement* of third country nationals was the standard policy for addressing the immigration problem.[27] GNCHR had called on the Greek authorities to comply with the recommendations of international bodies and guarantee that detention conditions of migrants, refugees and asylum seekers were in line with the right to health and human dignity.[28]

II. Information provided by other stakeholders

A. Background and framework

1. Scope of international obligations[29]

19. Joint Submission 1 (JS1) noted the ratification by Greece of several instruments in line with recommendations in the first UPR, but that contrary to the recommendation it had accepted it had not ratified the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness.[30] It also noted that in ratifying the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance, Greece had failed to recognize the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals.[31]

20. JS1 noted that Greece had not ratified the ICRMW, OP-ICESCR and CRC-OP-IC and had not accepted the individual complaints procedure under the International Covenant on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.[32]

21. The Council of Europe (CoE) noted that Greece had signed but not ratified the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities and had not yet signed or ratified the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages.[33] It also noted that in 2014 Greece ratified the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Beings.[34] Amnesty International (AI) and CoE reported that Greece had signed but not ratified the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence.[35]

2. Constitutional and legislative framework

22. JS1 stated that the Constitution stipulated that international treaties shall prevail over any contrary provision of the law, but that domestic jurisprudence indicated that this was not universally respected, even in cases where the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) and the Human Rights Committee had found Greece to be in violation of international treaties.[36] The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (EU-FRA) noted that in 2013, Greece was among states with the highest number of leading cases pending at the ECtHR, or non-repetitive cases that related to general or structural problems that could only be addressed by legislation.[37]

3. Institutional and human rights infrastructure and policy measures

23. JS1 noted that Greece had accepted a recommendation to develop and implement a National Action Plan on Human Rights and that a plan for the period 2014-2016 was published in March 2014 but it had effectively not been implemented since then.[38]

24. Lumos recommended that Greece develop and implement a national action plan on the protection of the rights of the child.[39]

25. JS1 referred to the 2013 finding of the Independent Expert on foreign debt[40] that the burden of the economic adjustment programme appeared not to have been shared fairly and that its impact had been particularly severe for the most vulnerable sectors of the population: the poor, older persons, pensioners, women, children, people with disabilities and immigrants.[41]

B. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

1. Equality and non-discrimination

26. Referring to the economic adjustment programme and the observations of the Independent Expert on foreign debt, JS1 stated that the rate of unemployment among women was significantly higher than for men and there had been a strong increase in involuntary part-time work among women.[42] Lumos stated that the economic crisis and austerity measures were disproportionately affecting children, especially children living in poverty, with a disability or from minority backgrounds, including migrants and refugees, particularly unaccompanied minors.[43]

27. JS1 was concerned at hate speech, not only by extremists, but also by the mainstream media and public figures, and at the abolition in 2014 of the criminalization of hate speech as defined in article 2 of the old law 927 of 1979.[44] AI stated that in the past four years, there had been an increase in hate-motivated crimes against refugees, migrants, Roma and members of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) community, some of which had been fatal.[45] The Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE-ODIHR) referred to the reports of incidents and statistics on such attacks which it had collected; these also included hate crimes affecting religious and ethnic minorities.[46] OSCE-ODIHR observed that the law enforcement agencies had not recorded the bias motivation of reported hate crimes and recommended that a system be put in place to record hate crimes by target group.[47] CoE referred to the 2013 findings of the Commissioner for Human Rights (CoE-Commissioner) that there had been a weak state response and that sustained and concerted action, notably by the police and the courts, was necessary.[48] CoE-Commissioner was concerned that the increase in hate crimes primarily targeted migrants and that a number of them had been linked to members or supporters of a neo-Nazi political party. It also noted that rhetoric stigmatising migrants was widely used in Greek politics.[49]

28. CoE-Commissioner recommended that the 70 newly established anti-racist police units be adequately resourced and trained in human rights and anti-discrimination and for their mandate to include all forms of hate crime.[50] In 2015, the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (CoE-ECRI) had made similar observations and recommended that Greece create a task force including the authorities, Ombudsman, National Human Rights Commission and NGOs to develop a comprehensive national strategy to combat racism and intolerance.[51] CoE-ECRI also recommended that the question of racist and/or homo-/transphobic motivations be considered from the outset in the investigation and judicial proceeding of cases of violent incidents and that the judiciary be

offered training on the application of the new article 81A of the Criminal Code concerning sentences for hate motivated offences.[52]

29. EU-FRA noted that the Greek Ombudsman had reported in 2013 that there were numerous racist incidents involving students, but also parents and even teachers, against students. The majority were related to the ethnic background of the students and teachers were often seen as tolerating this type of violence.[53] It also noted that the Greek police set up a telephone help line for victims of racist violence in 2014 which had registered 214 complaints by September 2014.[54] CoE-ECRI recommended that the telephone hotline be staffed with interpreters and that staff be instructed to provide detailed information on the procedure for reporting racist violence and information on assistance available to victims.[55]

30. JS1 noted that in the first UPR, Greece had pledged to include sexual orientation and gender identity as grounds for protection in anti-discrimination legislation and policies, as well as to consider recognizing same-sex couples.[56] It noted amendments to legislation, but that, in replying to the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Greece had admitted that that the legislation prohibited discrimination on the grounds of religion or other belief, disability, age or sexual orientation, but only in employment and occupation and not in social protection, education, access to goods and services.[57] JS1 considered that discrimination in the Criminal Code relating to male homosexual acts, which had been identified by the GNCHR in 2005, still existed.[58] JS1 further stated that television and radio stations had repeatedly been fined, for example for broadcasting homosexual kisses, but homophobic programmes had not been sanctioned.[59]

31. AI recommended that Greece ensure that gender identity is recognized in law and allow individuals to change their legal name and gender, including the gender markers on official documents, through quick, accessible and transparent procedures and to abolish any medical requirement for the purpose of obtaining legal gender recognition.[60]

2. Right to life, liberty and security of the person

32. CoE referred to the 2014 findings of the Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CoE-CPT).[61] CoE-CPT received a great number of detailed, coherent and consistent allegations of physical ill-treatment of persons by police officers.[62] CoE-Commissioner was deeply concerned about persistent reports of ill-treatment, including torture, by law enforcement officials against migrants and Roma.[63] AI referred to alleged cases of torture, ill-treatment and excessive use of force by law enforcement officials, including during demonstrations.[64]

33. AI was concerned that Greece had still not brought the definition of torture in the Criminal Code into line with international standards and that rape and other forms of sexual violence were not explicitly included as forms of torture.[65] JS1 noted that in the first UPR, Greece had committed to ensuring prompt and impartial investigations of cases of excessive use of force by the police and law enforcement officials and establishing quickly an independent and effective police complaints mechanism, but that the Office responsible for handling alleged instances of abuses, which was formally set up in 2014, remained inoperative and lacked the necessary independence because it operated within the Ministry of Citizen Protection.[66] AI considered that the recommendations had not been implemented.[67] CoE-Commissioner was concerned at persistent reports of ill-treatment by law enforcement officers, notably against migrants and Roma and called on the authorities to eliminate the institutional culture of impunity and address effectively all suspicions of collusion of a part of the police with a neo-Nazi political party.[68] CoE-CPT noted a lack of promptness and thoroughness in carrying out investigations and also had recommendations regarding the recruitment and training of police officers and the improvement of safeguards such as access to lawyers and doctors.[69]

34. CoE noted that CoE-CPT had found that the measures taken to tackle prison overcrowding had not had a lasting effect, that the prisons it visited operated at up to 300 percent of their capacity and that the lack of staff impeded efforts to maintain effective control.[70]

35. Lumos noted that there was no effective legislation regulating quality standards for both state and privately run residential care institutions for children, despite a Ministerial decision on regulating privately run institutions in 2014.[71] It was concerned at reports which included the use of caged beds for children with disabilities; the use of corporal punishment and other types of physical and hard psychological discipline; and of neglect.[72] It called for a comprehensive standardised system to respond to allegations of child maltreatment, neglect, torture and other forms of abuse across the country.[73]

36. EU-FRA stated that its research showed that one out of 10 Roma children of compulsory school age in Greece were working outside their home; working conditions were generally unsafe, as their occupation mostly consisted of collecting objects for reselling or recycling, or begging on the street for money.[74]

3. Administration of justice and the rule of law

37. JS1 referred to the 2014 observations of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention and considered that access to justice had been significantly curtailed by the reported overburdening and understaffing of courts and its reports of complaints from lawyers providing free defence that the fees were low and were paid with considerable delay.[75] CoE-Commissioner expressed similar concerns including on the length of proceedings, lack of an effective remedy and costly court fees and called for increased resources for judges and prosecutors and for victims of hate crime to receive exemptions from fees and adequate legal aid.[76]

38. In relation to support to the victims of crime, EU-FRA observed that Greece did not provide generic victim support services and that informing victims about the place and time of the trial and the nature of the charges was not regulated by law.[77]

39. EU-FRA mentioned that alternative dispute resolution methods were unpopular and still rather unknown in Greece.[78]

40. CoE noted the publication of the second report of the Group of States against Corruption (CoE-GRECO) on Greece in 2014.[79] CoE-GRECO concluded that out of the twenty-six pending recommendations, only three had been implemented satisfactorily and six had been partly implemented and that the level of compliance remained "globally unsatisfactory".[80]

4. Right to privacy and family life

41. EU-FRA referred to a lack of trust in the effectiveness of the remedies in the area of data protection or in public institutions in general.[81]

42. Lumos was concerned that the authorities did not have any system for collecting data on children being admitted to and living in institutions and was gravely concerned that babies and toddlers were being cared for in residential institutions.[82] It recommended a move towards the deinstitutionalization of all children and programmes in line with the United Nations Guidelines for the Alternative Care of Children.[83] Lumos also called for Greece to make private adoptions illegal; ensure that all adoptions in the country are implemented by the authorities and that there were no financial gains for anyone involved.[84]

5. Freedom of religion or belief, expression, association and peaceful assembly, and right to participate in public and political life

43. With reference to Shari'a law affecting family and inheritance for Muslims residing in Western Thrace and the recommendation from the first UPR, the Federation of Western Thrace Turks in Europe (ABTTF) noted that all decisions of the muftis appointed by the Greek government on marriages, divorces or inheritance issuance were liable to be made null and void by first instance courts and therefore, it was the responsibility of the State under review to prevent any impediments that may occur.[85] ABTTF urged Greece to comply with the applicable bilateral treaties and allow the Turkish minority in Thrace to freely elect its own religious leaders.[86]

44. ADF International (ADF) stated the prohibition on proselytism in law was vague and called on Greece to abolish it and encourage the free exchange of ideas and religious beliefs and recognize that freedom of religion included the right to try to convert others by non-coercive means of communication and persuasion.[87]

45. EU-FRA mentioned that Athens had no mosque to serve the needs of a large community of Muslims.[88]

46. ADF stated that sections 196, 198 and 199 of the Criminal Code, including those which referred to blasphemy and insulting the Eastern Orthodox Church, represented serious threats to freedom of expression and recommended that they be repealed.[89]

47. Joint Submission 2 (JS2) stated that the laws providing for conscientious objection to military service continued to fall short of international standards. It was concerned, inter alia, that the assessment of applications remained under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Defence.[90] In 2012, CoE-ECSR found that the length of alternative service to armed military service was excessive.[91] JS2 called for a non-punitive, non-discriminatory civilian service for individuals to be allowed to register as conscientious objectors at any time before, during or after conscription and for information to be readily available to those liable to conscription.[92]

48. ABTTF stated that Law 3592 of 2007 on Concentration and Licencing of Media Enterprises and Other Provisions contained provisions which hindered potential local and regional media from obtaining broadcasting licences; in 2014 three radio stations belonging to the Turkish minority had been issued with warnings because their programming in Greek was less than 25 percent.[93]

49. The European Organisation of Military Associations (EUROMIL) called on Greece to reconsider the military laws and regulations, which posed serious constraints on the exercise of the rights to freedom of opinion and expression of staff of the armed forces, even in cases not related to national security and the protection of confidential information.[94]

50. OSCE-ODIHR noted that the Constitution only provided for "Greeks" to have the right to peaceful assembly and recommended that this right be protected in law for all, including non-citizens, and had other observations on restrictions to peaceful assembly.[95]

6. Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work

51. EU-FRA stated that evidence from Greece showed that ethnic and/or racial discrimination was the most frequently reported type of discrimination in 2012, particularly in the area of employment.[96]

52. With reference to severe labour exploitation, EU-FRA stated that corruption had been identified as one of the main legal and institutional risk factors.[97] EU-FRA also stated that the resources for monitoring and inspection of working conditions were limited. In its

research some respondents suggested that in the Greek tourism industry the improbability of being inspected conveyed a clear message of impunity.[98] It also stated that evidence supported the view that, for victims of labour exploitation, the conditions for accessing rights and justice were, at best, precarious.[99]

53. EUROMIL stated that in 2012 the Supreme Court had considered that members of the armed forces should fully enjoy freedom of association, when not on military operations and when they were not performing the duties of their service, but the decision had not been fully incorporated in legislation.[100]

54. EUROMIL noted that the reduction in remuneration for the armed forces had been disproportionately great in relation to other social groups and the State had not complied with a January 2015 finding of Supreme Court finding that military salary cuts imposed in 2012 were unconstitutional.[101] EUROMIL also had other concerns about the unequal treatment of military personnel in relation to other civil servants with respect to parental leave and other conditions of service.[102]

7. Right to social security and to an adequate standard of living

55. In 2013 CoE-ECSR found that the minimum unemployment benefit for beneficiaries without dependents was manifestly inadequate and that there was no legally established general assistance scheme that would ensure that everyone in need had an enforceable right to social assistance.[103]

8. Right to health

56. In 2013, CoE-ECSR found in relation to the right to the protection of health that it could not establish that there were adequate measures for counselling and screening for the population at large nor could it established that there were adequate measures for counselling and screening for pregnant women and adolescents.[104] It also could not establish that sufficient measures had been adopted to improve the right to a healthy environment for persons living in lignite mining areas.[105]

9. Right to education

57. AI was concerned that Roma children continued to face segregation or exclusion from education in many parts of Greece and referred to a visit to a primary school in Sofades in April 2015 which, despite a 2013 judgment of the ECtHR on the issue, was found to be attended only by Roma pupils and was also particularly dilapidated and subject to disruption by frequent power cuts.[106]

10. Persons with disabilities

58. JS1 was concerned that Greece had never provided information about the application of anti-discrimination legislation in cases of discrimination against persons with disability.[107] It was also concerned about the absence of data that would indicate if persons with disabilities are discriminated against in employment, social services, education, etc, including in the initial report to the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.[108] In 2012 CoE-ECSR could not establish that people with disability were guaranteed effective equal access to employment.[109]

59. JS1 noted research that had found that only 15 percent of children with disabilities in Greece attended school and that the main obstacles were a lack of transportation, infrastructure such as ramps, audio-visual aids, staff and regular funding.[110] JS1 also noted the lack of a database to evaluate the functioning and needs of special education schools and the effects of the financial crisis on those schools.[111]

60. EU-FRA noted that there was no legislation setting out how people living long-term in institutions could exercise their right to vote and that no political parties produced their manifestos in formats accessible to persons with disabilities.[112]

11. Minorities

61. ABTTF stated that Greece recognized only a "Muslim minority in Thrace" and denied the existence of an ethnic Turkish minority and did not subscribe to the right of self-identification of any group.[113] It stated that Greece continued to place legal restrictions on the names of associations belonging to the Turkish minority which included the term "Turkish".[114] JS1 noted that Greece had supported a recommendation in the first UPR to implement judgments of the ECtHR on the registration of three such associations which were issued in 2007 and 2008 but that the judgments had not been executed.[115] JS1 also noted that in 2015 the ECtHR had found that Greece had violated the right to freedom of association in the case of a Macedonian minority association and had ignored the first ECtHR judgment on the case from 1998.[116]

62. Referring to recommendations from the first UPR on cooperation with civil society, ABTTF regretted that the authorities had not consulted any association of the Turkish minority in Western Thrace during the preparation of the national report or follow-up to the first UPR and called on Greece to set up an official consultation mechanism with the Turkish minority.[117]

63. JS1 noted commitments in the first UPR to take measures to provide Roma with increased education and employment and implement adopted strategies in this field.[118] It considered that the National Roma Inclusion Strategy which was published in 2011 had effectively not been implemented.[119] EU-FRA noted efforts towards the integration of Roma in the fields of education, employment, infrastructure in Roma settlements and healthcare, but that the socio-medical centres, which were operating in municipalities with a high Roma population, ran out of financing in 2013 because of the country's economic crisis.[120] It noted that 43 per cent of Roma children of compulsory school age were not attending school: that a low proportion Roma continued education after the age of 16, particularly women; and that only 65 per cent of Roma aged 16-24 years were literate.[121] EU-FRA further reported that a high proportion of Roma women were without health insurance.[122]

12. Migrants, refugees and asylum seekers

64. JS1 recalled the pledge of Greece in the first UPR to ensure that asylum-seekers and irregular migrants would be treated according to its human rights obligations and to strengthen all efforts to implement the National Action Plan on Asylum and Migration Management.[123] JS1 also noted that in 2012 the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants had acknowledged progress but had expressed concern over the lack of automatic judicial review of deportation orders.[124] It considered that this practice persisted and that there was a lack of other protection measures, such as access to interpreters and lawyers.[125] CoE-Commissioner was concerned that the collective expulsions of foreign nationals violated international and European human rights law.[126] He was also concerned at allegations of ill-treatment of migrants by members of the coastguard and border police and called for effective investigations of such incidents and for effective measures to prevent their recurrence.[127] While welcoming positive steps from Greece, he called on the country to radically change its migration policy and practice.[128]

65. AI was concerned that heightened security at the land border with Turkey had prompted more refugees and migrants to take the dangerous sea route and noted that more than 243 persons had died in capsized boats in the first nine months of 2015.[129] AI considered that a failing European migration system, poor planning, ineffective use of

European Union funds by the central authorities and the financial crisis had inflamed the crisis in the reception centres on the Greek Islands.[130] It found squalid conditions in informal camps and considered that conditions in immigration detentions centres amounted to inhuman and degrading treatment.[131] AI called for an end to pushbacks of on the sea and land borders; for an end to the detention of migrant or refugee children in law and practice and increased shelter capacity for asylum seekers and unaccompanied children.[132]

66. EU-FRA mentioned that Greece required excessive or disproportionate fees for residence permits as a practical obstacle to migrant integration.[133]

Notes

[1] The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org. (One asterisk denotes a national human rights institution with "A" status).

Civil society:

Individual submissions:

ABTTF	Federation of Western Thrace Turks in Europe (Avrupa Batı Trakya Türk Federasyonu), Witten (Germany);
ADF	ADF International (Alliance Defending Freedom), Geneva (Switzerland);
AI	Amnesty International, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);
EUROMIL	European Organisation of Military Associations, Brussels (Belgium);
Lumos	Lumos, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).

Joint submissions:

JS1	Joint submission 1 submitted by: Coalition of NGOs for UPR-Greece, comprising: Greek Helsinki Monitor (GHM), Minority Rights Group - Greece (MRG-G); the Humanist Union of Greece (HUG); and Coordinated Organizations and Communities for Roma Human Rights in Greece (SOKADRE), Glyka Nera (Greece).
JS2	Joint submission 2 submitted by: the European Bureau for Conscientious Objection (EBCO), Brussels (Belgium) and the Association of Greek Conscientious Objectors (AGCO), Athens (Greece).

National human rights institution:

GNCHR*	Greek National Commission for Human Rights, Athens (Greece).

Regional intergovernmental organizations:

CoE	The Council of Europe, Strasbourg (France); Attachments: CoE-CPT(2014) – Report to the Greek Government on the visit to Greece carried out by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) from 4 to 16 April 2013, Strasbourg, 16 October 2014, CPT/Inf (2014) 26; CoE-CPT(2014-Response) – Response of the Greek Government to the report of the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) on its visit to Greece from 4 to 16 April 2013, Strasbourg, 16 October 2014, CPT/Inf (2014) 27; CoE-Commissioner(2013) – Report by Nils Muižnieks Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe following his visit to Greece from 28 January to 1 February 2013, Strasbourg, 16 April 2013, CommDH(2013)6; CoE-Commissioner(2013-Comments) – Comments of the Government of Greece on the Report of the Commissioner for Human Rights; Letter dated 5 December 2013 from the Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe to the Minister of Public Order and Citizen Protection and the Minister of Shipping and the Aegean Sea of Greece and reply dated 10 January 2014 from the Minister of Public Order and Citizen Protection of Greece; CoE-ECRI(2012) – ECRI Conclusions on the Implementation of the Recommendations in Respect of Greece Subject to Interim Follow-up, Adopted on 22 June 2012, CRI(2012)47; CoE-ECRI(2015) – ECRI Report on Greece (fifth monitoring cycle), Adopted on 10 December 2014, Published on 24 February 2015, CRI(2015)1; CoE-GRECO(2014) – Group of States against Corruption (GRECO) Third Evaluation Round, Second Interim, Compliance Report on Greece, "Incriminations (ETS 173 and 191, GPC 2)", "Transparency of Party Funding", Adopted by GRECO at its 64th Plenary Meeting, Strasbourg, 16-20 June 2014, Greco RC-III (2014) 8E, Interim Report;

	CoE-ECSR(2011) – European Social Charter, European Committee of Social Rights, Conclusions XIX-4 (2011), Greece, Articles 7, 8, 16, 17 and 19 of the Charter, January 2012;
	CoE-ECSR(2012) – European Social Charter, European Committee of Social Rights, Conclusions XX-1 (2012), Greece, Articles 1, 9, 10, 15,18 of the 1961 Charter and Article 1 of the 1988 Additional Protocol, January 2013;
	CoE-ECSR(2013) – European Social Charter, European Committee of Social Rights Conclusions XX-2,Greece, Articles 3, 11, 12, 13 and 14 of the 1961 Charter and article 4 of the additional protocol of 1988, November 2014;
	CoE-ECSR(2014) – European Social Charter, European Committee of Social Rights, Conclusions XX-3 (2014), Greece, Articles 2 and 4 of the 1961 Charter and Articles 2 and 3 of the 1988 Additional Protocol, January 2015;
EU-FRA	European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, Vienna (Austria);
OSCE-ODIHR	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe – Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, Warsaw (Poland).

[2] GNCHR, para. 3. See also JS1, para. 6.
[3] GNCHR, para. 3.
[4] GNCHR, para. 3. See also para. 23; para. 16 of this document; CoE, p. 5; JS1, para. 22; CoE-ECRI, paras. 1-2 and p. 43.
[5] GNCHR, para. 4. See also OSCE-ODIHR, p. 5.
[6] GNCHR, para. 6. See also CoE-ECSR(2014), p. 11.
[7] GNCHR, para. 7.
[8] GNHCR, para. 8.
[9] GNCHR, para. 10.
[10] GNCHR, para. 11.
[11] GNCHR, para. 16. See also JS1, para. 40; AI, p. 2; para. 33 of this document.
[12] GNCHR, para. 16.
[13] GNCHR, para. 15.
[14] GNCHR, para. 15.
[15] GNCHR, para. 13.
[16] GNCHR, para. 13.
[17] GNCHR, para. 14.
[18] GNCHR, para. 14.
[19] GNCHR, para. 17.
[20] GNCHR, para. 17.
[21] GNCHR, para. 20.
[22] GNCHR, para. 21.
[23] GNCHR, para. 22. See also AI, p. 7; OSCE-ODIHR, p. 5.
[24] GNCHR, para. 23. See also para. 3; para. 4 of this document; JS1, para. 26.
[25] GNCHR, para. 2. See also JS1, para. 38.
[26] GNCHR, para. 24.
[27] GNCHR, para. 24. See also CoE, pp. 3-4; CoE-Commissioner(2013), pp. 3, 5-6 and 29-31; CoE-Commissioner(2013-Commments), pp. 4-5; JS1, paras. 15-17; AI, pp. 4-5.
[28] GNCHR, para. 25.
[29] The following abbreviations are used in UPR documents:

ICERD	International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
OP-ICESCR	Optional Protocol to ICESCR
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
ICCPR-OP 1	Optional Protocol to ICCPR
ICCPR-OP 2	Second Optional Protocol to ICCPR, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women
OP-CEDAW	Optional Protocol to CEDAW

CAT	Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
OP-CAT	Optional Protocol to CAT
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
OP-CRC-AC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the involvement of children in armed conflict
OP-CRC-SC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography
OP-CRC-IC	Optional Protocol to CRC on a communications procedure
ICRMW	International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities
OP-CRPD	Optional Protocol to CRPD
ICPPED	International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance

[30] JS1, paras. 4-5. See also A/HRC/18/13, paras. 83.1 (Algeria, Austria, Brazil, France, Ukraine), 83.2 (Argentina, India), 83.3 (Ecuador), 83.4 (Morocco), 83.5 (Spain); 83.6 (Argentina) and 83.7 (Armenia), 83.8 (France), 84.3 (State of Palestine), 84.4 (Cyprus), 84.5 (Armenia, Brazil), 84.6 (Slovenia), 84.7 (Chile) and 84.8 (Slovakia).
[31] JS1, 4. See also A/HRC/18/13, para. 83.8 (France).
[32] JS1, para. 6. See also A/HRC/18/13, paras. 84.1 (Ukraine), 84.2 (Portugal, Spain), 84.3 (State of Palestine), 84.4 (Cyprus); GNCHR, para. 3.
[33] CoE, p. 5. See also JS1, para. 22; GNCHR, para. 3; para. 4 of this document.
[34] CoE, p. 5.
[35] AI, p. 2; CoE, p. 5.
[36] JS1, para. 7. See also paras. 10, 11, 27, 30 and 36.
[37] EU-FRA, para. 8.
[38] JS1, para. 9. See also A/HRC/18/13, para. 84.9 (Spain).
[39] Lumos, para. 8.2.
[40] The full title is the Independent Expert on the effects of foreign debt and other related international financial obligations of States on the full enjoyment of all human rights, particularly economic, social and cultural rights.
[41] JS1, para. 14. See also A/HRC/25/50/Add.1, para. 42.
[42] JS1, para. 14. See also A/HRC/25/50/Add.1, para. 47.
[43] Lumos, para. 1.5.
[44] JS1, para. 25.
[45] AI, pp. 5-6.
[46] OSCE-ODIHR, pp. 3-4.
[47] OSCE-ODIHR, p. 4.
[48] CoE, p. 2. See also CoE-Commissioner(2013), p. 10.
[49] CoE, p. 2. See also CoE-Commissioner(2013), p. 2.
[50] CoE, p. 3. See also p. 4; CoE-Commissioner(2013), pp. 3 and 26-27; CoE-ECRI(2015), pp. 9 and 26; OSCE-ODIHR, p. 4.
[51] CoE, p. 4. See also CoE-ECRI(2015), p. 26.
[52] CoE, p. 4. See also CoE-ECRI(2015), p. 27.
[53] EU-FRA, p. 8.
[54] EU-FRA, p. 9.
[55] CoE-ECRI(2015), para. 78. See also para. 77.
[56] JS1, para. 34. See also A/HRC/18/13, para. 83.30 (Norway) and 84.11 (Brazil).
[57] JS1, para. 34. See also E/C.12/GRC/Q/2/Add.1, para. 14.
[58] JS1, para. 35.
[59] JS1, para. 37.
[60] AI, p. 8. See also p. 2.
[61] See CoE, pp. 1-2.
[62] CoE, p. 1. See also CoE-CPT(2014), p. 13; CoE-CPT(2014-Response).
[63] CoE, p. 3. See also CoE-Commissioner(2013), p. 3; AI, p. 5.

[64] AI, p. 5.
[65] AI, p. 1.
[66] JS1, para. 40. See also A/HRC/18/13, paras. 83.38 (Turkey), 83.40 (Austria), 83.41 (Lebanon), 83.42 (Switzerland), 83.43 (Botswana), 83.44 (Indonesia), 83.45 (Hungary) and 83.46 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland); CoE, p. 1-3; CoE-CPT(2014), p. 17; CoE-CPT(2014-Response), pp. 23-24; CoE-Commissioner, p. 25; GNCHR, para. 16 and para. 10 of this document.
[67] AI, pp. 1-2. See also A/HRC/18/13, paras. 83.38 (Turkey), 83.40 (Austria), 83.41 (Lebanon), 83.42 (Switzerland), 83.43 (Botswana), 83.44 (Indonesia), 83.45 (Hungary) and 83.46 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).
[68] CoE, p. 3; CoE-Commissioner (2013), pp. 2 and 26.
[69] CoE, pp. 1-2. See also CoE-CPT(2014), p. 16.
[70] CoE, p. 1. See also CoE-CPT(2014), p. 52; CoE-CPT(2014-Response), p. 56.
[71] Lumos, paras. 3.1 and 3.3. See also paras 3.2, 3.4, 3.5, 8.1 and 8.2.
[72] Lumos, para. 4.1. See also para. 8.3.
[73] Lumos, para. 8.3.
[74] EU-FRA, p. 8.
[75] JS1, para. 13. See also A/HRC/27/48/Add.1, paras. 51 and 55.
[76] CoE, pp. 2-3. See also CoE-Commissioner(2013), pp. 2, 18, 19 and 21; CoE-Commissioner(2013-Comments), p. 4.
[77] EU-FRA, p. 13.
[78] EU-FRA, p. 10.
[79] CoE, pp. 5-6.
[80] CoE, pp. 5-6. See also CoE-GRECO(2014), p. 2.
[81] EU-FRA, p. 17.
[82] Lumos, paras. 2.2 and 4.2. See also para. 2.1.
[83] Lumos, para. 8.1. See also paras. 2.3 and 8.2; A/RES/64/142.
[84] Lumos, para. 8.4. See also para. 5.1.
[85] ABTTF, p. 1. See also A/HRC/18/13, para. 83.22 (Netherlands).
[86] ABTTF, p. 2. See also p. 5.
[87] ADF, paras. 23 and 27. See also paras. 13-22.
[88] EU-FRA, p. 20.
[89] ADF, paras. 4, 12 and 27. See also paras. 3 and 5-11.
[90] JS2, p. 2.
[91] CoE-ECSR(2012), pp. 8-9.
[92] JS2, p. 6. See also AI, p. 8.
[93] ABTTF, p. 4.
[94] EUROMIL, p. 2.
[95] OSCE-ODIHR, pp. 6-7.
[96] EU-FRA, p. 8.
[97] EU-FRA, p. 11.
[98] EU-FRA, p. 11.
[99] EU-FRA, p. 12.
[100] EUROMIL, p. 1.
[101] EUROMIL, pp. 2-3.
[102] EUROMIL, pp. 4-5.
[103] CoE, p. 9. See also CoE-ECSR(2013), pp. 26-27 and 37.
[104] CoE, p. 9. See also CoE-ECSR(2013), p. 19.
[105] CoE, p. 9. See also CoE-ECSR(2013), pp. 22-24.
[106] AI, p. 7. See also GNCHR, para. 22; para. 16 of this document; JS1, paras. 29-31.
[107] JS1, para. 38. See also GNCHR, para. 3.
[108] JS1, para. 38.
[109] CoE, p. 8. See also CoE-ECSR(2012), pp. 24-25.
[110] JS1, para. 39.
[111] JS1, para. 39.
[112] EU-FRA, p. 19 and 20.
[113] ABTTF, pp. 3-4.

[114] ABTTF, p. 4.
[115] JS1, para. 10. See also ABTTF, pp. 3-4; CoE, p. 6.
[116] JS1, para. 10.
[117] ABTTF, p. 1. See also A/HRC/18/13, paras. 83.16 (State of Palestine) and 83.96 (Austria).
[118] JS1, para. 26. See also A/HRC/18/13, paras. 83.62 (Sweden) and 83.63 (United States of America).
[119] JS1, para. 26. See also GNCHR, para. 23; para. 16 of this document.
[120] EU-FRA, p. 97.
[121] EU-FRA, p. 21. See also OSCE-ODIHR, p. 5; JS1, para. 31.
[122] EU-FRA, p. 21.
[123] JS1, para. 17. See also A/HRC/18/13, paras. 83.66 (Lebanon), 83.67 (Poland), 83.68 (Austria), 83.69 (Canada), 83.70 (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland), 83.71 (Switzerland), 83.72 (Canada), 83.73 (Poland) and 83.74 (Brazil).
[124] JS1, para. 17. See also A/HRC/23/46, para. 38.
[125] JS1, para. 17.
[126] CoE, p. 3. See also CoE-Commissioner, letter dated 5 December 2013 from the Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe to the Minister of Public Order and Citizen Protection and the Minister if Shipping and the Aegean Sea of Greece and reply dated 10 January 2014 from the Minister of Public Order and Citizen Protection of Greece.
[127] CoE, p. 3. See also CoE-Commissioner, letter dated 5 December 2013 from the Commissioner for Human Rights of the Council of Europe to the Minister of Public Order and Citizen Protection and the Minister if Shipping and the Aegean Sea of Greece and reply dated 10 January 2014 from the Minister of Public Order and Citizen Protection of Greece.
[128] CoE, p. 3.
[129] AI, p. 4. See also, CoE, pp. 3-4; GNCHR, p. 6.
[130] AI, p. 4.
[131] AI, p. 5.
[132] AI, p. 8. See also CoE, pp. 3-4.
[133] EU-FRA, para. 1.4.